REMARKS

Upon entry of the present Request for Reconsideration, the claims in the application remain claims 1-10 and 13-18, of which claims 1 and 7 are independent.

The applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that claims 7-10 and 13-18 are allowed, and claims 4-5 include allowable subject matter.

In addition, the applicant thanks the Examiner for her helpful remarks during a telephone interview which took place by telephone on December 8, 2005. During this conversation, the applicant's representative presented arguments against the rejection of claim 1 as obvious in view of the references Ko and Trumble. No agreement was reached. Instead, the Examiner requested that such arguments be presented in writing so that they can be fully considered and discussed with her supervisor before a decision is made.

The above-identified Office Action has been reviewed, the applied references carefully considered, and the Examiner's comments carefully weighed. In view thereof, the present Request for Reconsideration is submitted. It is contended that by the previous Amendment A and in light of the arguments against the rejections presented herein, all bases of rejection set forth in the Office Action have been traversed and overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §103 (a)

1. At item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko (JP 2001-191768) in view of Trumble (US 3,461,423). The Examiner states that in the abstract and Figs. 1-10 of Ko, a vehicle tire monitoring

system is disclosed which includes a sensor unit 1 at each vehicle tire including a transmitting antenna, a monitoring unit 2 having a receiving antenna 26 and an alarm section 27 in which the monitoring unit receives the sensing pressure and determines whether the tire pressure is proper, and a battery 21 to supply power to the alarm section, but that Ko fails to disclose a manually operated switch to supply power to the alarm regardless of the operating condition of the vehicle. The Examiner considers Trumble to teach a manually operated switch 1 installed in the vehicle to supply power to the alarm section regardless of the operating condition of the vehicle while bypassing the ignition switch. The Examiners states that it would be obvious to apply the teaching of Trumble to Ko's monitoring system to supply power to the alarm regardless of the operating condition of the vehicle for the convenience of the user.

Applicant's Response

The applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's rejection and the disclosures of the Ko and Trumble references. The applicant finds that Ko teaches a pressure detection system generally including pressure detection units 1 on each of the tires, a monitoring unit 2 and a remote control display unit 3. Each pressure detection unit 1 includes a transmitter (antenna) 14 to transmit the inflation pressure detection signal to the monitoring unit, and a power source 11. The transmitted signal is then received by a receiver 26 in the monitoring unit 2, the monitoring unit 2 including a power source 21. The receiver 26 of the monitor unit 2 then determines whether the detection signal is normal, and a warning, if appropriate, is displayed on a display 27. A transmitter 24 within the monitoring unit then transmits the inflation pressure detection signal to the remote control display unit 3. The remote control display unit 3 is equipped with a power source 31 and a

display 37, e.g., including light emitting diodes for indicating to the user if the pressure is normal or not normal.

Upon review of Trumble, the applicant finds that Trumble discloses a vehicle alarm system. In particular, Trumble discloses a distress tone generator which generates an audible signal "for the sole purpose of preserving lives and protecting property in vehicles." (col. 1 lines 15-16). In particular, Trumble discloses manual or automatic activation of a switch in the event that a motor of a vehicle is started without first turning the ignition switch to the on position, so as to indicate that a vehicle is being stolen.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of claim 1 since Ko, as hypothetically modified by Trumble, does not suggest or disclose every claimed feature. In particular, Ko does not disclose a monitoring unit which compares the output received from the pressure sensor with a predetermined value to determine whether the tire pressure is proper. Instead, Ko is silent as to how receiver 26 judges whether the output received from the pressure sensor is normal.

In addition, Ko does not disclose a battery mounted on the vehicle and connected to the alarm section through an ignition switch to supply operating power to the alarm section. Although Ko does disclose that the alarm section includes a power source 21, Ko does not disclose that the power source 21 is connected through an ignition switch, as claimed. Moreover, Ko discloses that the pressure detection system is equipped with an independent power source such that the system power of the car is unnecessary. Thus, the power source 21 of Ko is clearly independent of the ignition switch of the vehicle.

Finally, the applicant agree s with the Examiner in that Ko does not disclose an operating

switch operable by the operator for supplying operating power to the alarm section by connecting the battery to the alarm section.

The modification of Ko by Trumble does not cure the deficiencies of Ko described above. Specifically, Trumble does not disclose a monitoring unit which compares the output received from the tire pressure sensor with a predetermined value to determine whether the tire pressure is proper since Trumble is directed to a vehicle theft alarm system rather than tire pressure monitoring systems. Furthermore, Trumble does not disclose a battery mounted on the vehicle and connected to the alarm section through an ignition switch to supply operating power to the alarm section since Trumble clearly discloses supplying power to the alarm system regardless of the state of the ignition switch.

Moreover, the applicant disagrees that it would be obvious to modify Ko by the teachings of Trumble to include a manually operated switch 1 installed in the vehicle to supply power to the alarm section regardless of the operating condition of the vehicle while bypassing the ignition switch, because the proposed modification appears to be improperly based on a suggestion coming entirely from the Examiner (guided by impermissible hindsight of applicant's disclosure), rather than from any teaching, suggestion or other motivation which may be gleaned from the references themselves. This statement is based on the following two reasons:

First, Ko clearly teaches that the alarm system includes a power source independent of the system power of the car. Thus, Ko teaches away from the modification suggested by the Examiner.

Second, the applicant submits that it would not be obvious to apply a teaching from a vehicle theft alarm system to a tire pressure monitoring system, since these areas of technology are non-analogous. In other words, persons of ordinary skill in the art would not have, in the first

place, looked to the vehicle theft art (Trumble) even if these persons were considering the possibility of modifying Ko's pressure detection system.

As regards the rejections of claims 2 and 3, the Examiner states that Ko discloses a warning lamp and display panel that informs the result of the determination by coloration. The applicant disagrees with these rejections for the reasons stated above with respect to the modification of Ko by Trumble.

2. **At item 3 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko and Trumble (US 3,461,423) in view of Walenty et al.** In the rejection, the Examiner states that Ko and Trumble do not specify the predetermined value is set based on a recommended cold pressure, but that Walenty et al. teach a method and apparatus detecting tire pressure in which the tire pressure output is compared with a vehicle manufacturer's recommended cold tire pressure. The Examiner further states that it would have been obvious to compare the pressure output with a standard value for keeping the result conformed to a norm applied to all other vehicles.

Applicant's Response

The applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection since the proposed combination of references fails to overcome the deficiencies of the applied references in relation to present independent claim 1. Moreover, the applicant notes that the US Patent Application issued to Walenty was not filed until November 7, 2003, which is subsequent to the priority date being

claimed in the present invention.

3. **At item 5 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 4 and 5, although objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form** including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Again, the applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

In conclusion, applicant has overcome the Examiner's rejections as presented in the Office Action; and moreover, applicant has considered all of the references of record, and it is respectfully submitted that the invention as defined by each of the present claims is patentably distinct thereover.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner is not fully convinced of all of the claims now in the application, applicant respectfully requests that he telephonically contact applicant's undersigned representative to expeditiously resolve prosecution of the application.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Carrier, Blackman & Associates, P.C.
24101 Novi Road, Suite 100
Novi, Michigan 48375
04January 2006

Joseph P. Carrier
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,748
(248) 344-4422

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the US Patent & Trademark Office, Art Unit 2636, on 04January 2006.

Dated: 04 January 2006
JPC/kmm